

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-17, 19-27, 29-31, 33-38 and 40-51 were pending and presented for examination. In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and withdraw them.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-17, 19-27, 36-38, 40-48 and 49-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Lowitz, et al. (US 5,485,554). These rejections are now traversed.

Claim 1 recites a system for printing media content, comprising, *inter alia*:

a user interface for receiving instructions from a user for controlling segmentation of the media content for printing based on one or more features within the media content and for generation of a printable representation of the media content, the user interface comprising a content selection field displaying a graphical representation of the media content and the instructions from the user comprising selection of a segment of the graphical representation of the media content;

Lowitz does not disclose or suggest these aspects of the claimed invention. Lowitz merely discloses processing an input video data stream to select a frame for printing, according to various triggers that may be selected by the user, e.g., a scene change, via a sequence trigger setup key. *See* Lowitz, Abstract, col. 5, ll. 57-61. However, none of the interfaces of Lowitz display a graphical representation of the media content, as claimed.

The Examiner argues that Lowitz discloses a content selection field displaying a graphical representation of the media content at col. 5, ll. 7-42 and col. 3, ll. 49-60. However, col. 5, ll. 7-42 describe a grab sequence operational key, a clear frame operational key, and a tag frame operational key, and col. 3, ll. 49-60 describe “a front panel 202 [that] represents a user interface which includes a display ... for displaying information associated

with use of keys on the interface.” The disclosed keys or the front panel does not disclose the claimed content selection field because neither the keys nor the front panel display a graphical representation of the media content. Thus, Lowitz does not disclose or suggest at least “a user interface ... comprising a content selection field displaying a graphical representation of the media content and the instructions from the user comprising selection of a segment of the graphical representation of the media content.” Accordingly, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Lowitz.

Independent claim 27 also is patentably distinguishable over Lowitz for the above reasons. Dependent claims 2-3, 5-12, 14-17, 19-26, 29-31, 33-38, and 40-51 variously depend from claims 1 and 27, shown above to be patentably distinguishable over the cited reference. All arguments advanced above with respect to claims 1 and 27 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claims 2-3, 5-12, 14-17, 19-26, 29-31, 33-38, and 40-51. Thus, claims 2-3, 5-12, 14-17, 19-26, 29-31, 33-38, and 40-51 are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference for at least the reasons stated above in addition to the further patentable limitations recited therein. For example, “user interface comprises an option to specify a number of timelines displayed per page” in claim 49, “user interface comprises an option to specify a number of pages to fit the one or more timelines” in claim 50, and “the content selection field comprises an edit segment option to edit a length of the defined segment” in claim 51 are not disclosed by the cited reference and therefore claims 49-51 are also further patentable because of these limitations.

Claim 24 is amended to depend from claim 1 instead of previously cancelled claim 18. This amendment does not require new grounds of rejection because based on the

Examiner's current rejection of claim 24, it is clear that the Examiner assumed that claim 24 depends from claim 1 in rejecting claim 24.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 29-31 and 33-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lowitz in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0249650 ("Freedman"). These rejections now are traversed.

Claims 29-31 and 33-35 were shown above to be patentably distinguishable over Lowitz.

Freedman does not remedy the above-stated deficiencies of Lowitz, nor does the Examiner allege that it does. Freedman is relied upon by the Examiner to show the additional limitations recited in dependent claims 29-31 and 33-35. Thus, claims 29-31 and 33-35 are patentably distinguishable over Freedman, alone or in combination with Lowitz.

The deficient disclosures of these references, considered either alone or in combination, fail to establish even a *prima facie* basis from which a proper determination of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) can be made. As discussed above, the references do not teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1- 3, 5-12, 14-17, 19-27, 29-31, 33-38, and 40-51, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jonathan J. Hull et al.

Date: June 10, 2009

By: /Jennifer R. Bush/

Jennifer Bush, Registration No. 50,784
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650)-335-7213
Fax: (650) 938-5200